

10/803901
P24834.A05

REMARKS

Summary of the Amendment

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 3, 7 and 10 will have been canceled, claims 1, 11, 19, 23-25 and 29 will have been amended, and claims 33 and 34 will have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-34 will be pending with claims 1, 23 and 25 being in independent form.

Summary of the Official Action

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-22, 24, 29 and 31 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-32 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner further also rejected claims 1-32 as indefinite. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-32 over the art of record. By the present amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the objections and rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

Interview of August 17, 2006

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by Examiner Maki in the interview of August 17, 2006. In that interview, Applicant's representative explained that the ratio was incorrectly indicated in the specification and claims as being Y/X instead of X/Y. It was

10/803901

P24834.A05

specifically emphasized that this error would be recognized by one having ordinary skill in the art, especially in view of the fact that Fig. 2 is described in the specification as being drawn to scale and clearly shows that the ratio of X/Y increases as the rim size decreases.

Applicant pointed out that the correct ration would be X/Y and have the following values for different rim sizes:

For $X/Y = 1 - (D_R/100) \times 1.5$ results:

TABLE 1

Tire dimension	D_R in inch	$1 - (D_R/100) \times 1.5$	X in mm	Y* in mm
135/80 R 13	13	0.805	108.675	135
185/55 R 14	14	0.79	146.15	185
195/65 R 15	15	0.775	151.125	195
205/45 R 16	16	0.76	155.8	205
225/45 R 17	17	0.745	167.625	225

(*For the sake of clarity, Y is based on the section width instead of on the somewhat smaller width of the road contact area.)

For $X/Y = 1 - (D_R/100) \times 5$ results:

TABLE 2

Tire dimension	D_R in inch	$1 - (D_R/100) \times 5$	X in mm	Y* in mm
135/80 R 13	13	0.35	47.25	135
185/55 R 14	14	0.3	55.5	185
195/65 R 15	15	0.25	48.75	195
205/45 R 16	16	0.2	41.0	205
225/45 R 17	17	0.15	33.75	225

(*For the sake of clarity, Y is based on the section width instead of on the somewhat smaller width of the road contact area.)

Interview Record OK 11-27-06

10/803901

P24834.A05

Although the Examiner did not appear to be persuaded that this was clear, the Examiner agreed to consider our arguments in an Amendment in view of the fact that an RCE would be filed in order to have IDS materials considered by the Examiner.

Applicant's representative also explained that the formal rejections should be moot if the incorrect formulas were deleted from the claims and if they were replaced with language describing that the ratio of X/Y increases as the rim size decreases. It was noted that such language is fully and clearly supported by the specification and Fig. 2. The Examiner agreed to consider such claim amendments in an Amendment filed with an RCE.

The Examiner responded by indicating that he would reconsider the rejection in view of such claim amendments upon the filing of Applicant's response.

Objection to the Specification is moot

The Examiner objected to the specification on page 3 of the instant Office Action because the specification allegedly lacks proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the specification to include the language noted by the Examiner to be lacking therefrom.

In view of the above, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification and indicate that the specification is acceptable under the Patent Office Rules.

Interview Record OK Jan 11-27-06